

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	Reclamation District 784	Amount Requested	\$7,734,980
Proposal Title	North Drainage Basin "C" Regional Detention Pond and Pump Station No. 10 Construction	Total Proposal Cost	\$15,469,960

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

This project will allow the Regional Detention Pond to be drained between storm events. The current system can only consider the water that can gravity out of the detention which reduces the system capacity by sixty percent. The work includes the pump station, backup generator, security structures, outfall to the Feather River, motor control center, SCADA system, and minor grading on the regional detention pond.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	3/12
Budget	3/5		
Schedule	3/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	0/12
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	4/5	Program Preferences	4/10
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			26

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is less than fully addressed and rationales are incomplete or insufficient. With the exception of permitting, task and deliverables are not definitive. The tasks lack an adequate level of detail to ensure the implementation of the project. The construction tasks are not descriptive regarding the level of effort and requirements needed to complete the project. It's also not clear if all project benefits will be realized by the end of this phase of the project, or once the project is completed as a "whole". Overall, the Work Plan lacks the required level of detail and supporting information to clearly articulate the project scope.

Budget

The Budgets for most of the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, but not all costs appear reasonable. Also, supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items shown in the Budget categories described in Exhibit B. With the exception of task description and documentation for construction, all other task Budgets are not sufficiently supported. For example,

there is no documentation or an explanation for task Budgets with the exception of the construction tasks. The documentation provided for the construction of the project adds up to the total project cost identified in Table 6; however, the construction task line item in Table 6 only reflects \$10,826,573 and does not match the total documented on page 6. There is no back up documentation for all other tasks listed in Table 6. It's unclear how task costs were calculated based on the information provided.

Schedule

The Schedule is not entirely consistent and reasonable. Schedule demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation between six and 12 months after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011). Construction contract award and Notice-to-Proceed occurs during the period of 4/30/2012 to 5/4/2012. The Schedule does not include PG&E work. PG&E's involvement should be reflected on the Schedule as this seems to be a critical path task item.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Goals and output indicators are appropriate for the project. The applicant did a good job with write up leading up to the Project Performance Measures Table. However, no documentation is provided to support feasibility and reasonableness of targets and outcome indicators. In other words, some of the outcome indicators and targets do not adequately evaluate change resulting from the project. For example, there is no discussion or support to indicate that a 5%-10% reduction in stormwater discharge turbidity is reasonable for this project. The water quality goals do not indicate setting up a baseline prior to the implementation of the project for comparing future water samples.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

Only low levels of Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. The FDR analysis is described well, and the flooding probabilities and damage estimates are documented. However, the FDR benefits only appear to cover a small fraction of the project costs. No water supply benefits are claimed.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

No water quality or other benefits are discussed in Attachment 9 or any of the economics attachments.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes a project that implements the following Program Preference, Include Regional Projects or Programs. The Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preference claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preference to be implemented.